

**GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**

**ABSTRACT**

Public Services – Agriculture Department – Disciplinary action initiated against Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, former A.O.(SC) and present ADA under Rule 20 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Service (CC&A) Rules, 1991 – Inquiry conducted – Final orders – Issued.

-----  
**AGICULTURE & COOPERATION (VIG.I) DEPARTMENT**

**G.O.Rt. No. 821**

**Dated. 01-07-2008.**

**Read the following:-**

1. G.O.Rt.No.107, Agri. & Coop. (Vig.I) Dept., Dt. 10-2-2003.
2. From Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, ADA O/o JDA., Visakhapatnam, written statement of defence, dt. 13-3-2003.
3. Govt. Memo No.1206/Vig.I/1/2003-1, Dt. 17-6-2003.
4. Govt. Memo No. 1206/Vig.I/1/2003-2, Dt. 17-6-2003.
5. From the JDA, Srikakulam & I.O. letter Rc.No.Estt.(1)401/ 2003, Dt. 22-12-2003.
6. Govt. Memo No. 1206/Vig.I/1/2003-8, A&C (Vig.I) Dept., Dt. 23-9-2006.
7. From Sri B.Prabhakara Rao, ADA, Representation dated 2-11-2006.

-o0o-

**O R D E R:**

Government have initiated disciplinary action against Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, former A.O.(SC) and present ADA under Rule 20 of the A.P.C.S. (CC&A) Rules, 1991 for making irregular recommendations for payment of Rs.3,23,405/- to ineligible farmers towards compensation to the horticultural crops damaged due to cyclone occurred on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> October, 1999 in Silagam Village of Kaviti Mandal, Srikakulam District and framed the following articles of charge:-

**Articles of Charge:** That the said Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, Assistant Director of Agriculture while working as Agricultural Officer O/o the Assistant Director of Agriculture (Soil Conservation), Srikakulam has recommended for payment of compensation to a tune of Rs.3,23,405/- for damages to the Horticulture crops due to cyclone occurred on 17-10-1999 and 18-10-1999 in Silagam village of Kaviti Mandal to 26 bogus cases, Landless persons, two times for the same land, compensation in excess of the land against the actual extent possessed by ryots and ghost cases without noting the Survey Nos. of the land in the proposals for payment of compensation and thus he violated Rule 3 of APCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964

2. The Charged Officer in his written statement of defence denied the charge and requested to accept his explanation and exonerate him from the above charge. Government decided to conduct regular inquiry into the charge and in the regular inquiry the inquiry officer held the charge not proved against the charged officer. Government had examined the inquiry report and decided to disagree with the findings of the Inquiry Officer. Accordingly a copy of the Inquiry Report along with disagreement factors was communicated to the Charged Officer for his representation if any in the matter. The Charged Officer in his representation has stated that while crop damage had to be assessed by the technocrats, the beneficiaries of land-owners by the Revenue Department Officials based on land records; that the work depends on two persons i.e., Technocrats and administrative official; that in such a case, holding only Technocrat responsible for Non-technical matters i.e., identification of land owners with Survey Nos. leaving the concerned administrative officials was unjust and unfair. He also stated that if any lapse in technical work i.e., identification of healthy crop as damaged crop was found, then the technocrat would be held responsible attributing the lapses as intentional for self gain. He also submitted

PTO

that in the entire case, the charge was only identification of land owners and non-mentioning of Survey Nos. resulted in recommendation of excess payment and loss to state exchequer. Further he stated that for the point of identification of land owners without Survey Nos. the enquiry officer i.e., Project Director, DPIIP, Srikakulam categorically held the VAO as responsible for the irregularities and that the District Collector, Srikakulam held that the irregularities were the result of 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of enumeration. He further stated that he made only preliminary enumeration and he was innocent of the lapses took place in the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of enumeration and he was not at all responsible for the lapses. Therefore, he has requested the Government to drop further action and exonerate from the case.

3. Government have carefully examined the matter and observes that in fact, the contention of the C.O. that they were totally led astray by the village officer itself, in a way, amounts to admission of the irregularities committed. Even assuming for a moment the absence of any malafide intention, the C.O. cannot be absolved of the guilt of careless and negligent enumeration. Therefore, Government have decided to impose the penalty of 'Censure' against Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, former Agriculture Officer, (SC) and present Assistant Director of Agriculture.

4. Accordingly, Government hereby impose the penalty of 'Censure' against Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, former A.O.(SC) and present Assistant Director of Agriculture. The Commissioner and Director of Agriculture, A.P., Hyderabad shall take necessary action accordingly.

**(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)**

**C.R. BISWAL**  
**PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO**  
**GOVERNMENT**

To

Sri B. Prabhakara Rao, former A.O.(SC) and present ADA,  
O/o. the JDA, Visakhapatnam through the C&DA, Hyderabad.

Copy to :

The Commissioner and Director of Agriculture, A.P., Hyderabad.

The Secretary, APVC, Hyderabad.

Sf/Sc.

// FORWARDED BY ORDER //

**SECTION OFFICER**